

# Christianity and

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion



VOL. XII, No. 14

AUGUST 4, 1952

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

## An Issue That Needs Re-Thinking

IN a surprisingly short time, as cultural changes are measured, the question of the place that is to be given to religion in general education has become a major issue in America. We have passed through an initial stage of bitter resentment on the part of prominent educators against all who seek to modify the long trend toward complete secularization of American education. Little by little it has become apparent that what is happening is not an attempt by religious groups to "capture" the schools, but a belated recognition that a nation which is still religious at heart cannot foster religious institutions and a religious faith while ignoring them in the education of its children and youth. The recent decision of the Supreme Court in the *Zorach* case, validating the released-time plan operating in New York City, was a strategic event vindicating, at least for the present, the moral resistance which the churches have offered to the sweeping negativism of the now famous *McColum* decision.

But to say all this is not to justify a paean of victory from the friends of weekday religious education, or from those who favor inclusion of certain religious subject matter in the school curriculum. This is no time for self-gratulation or assuming that something conclusive has been accomplished.

In the first place, we have learned a good deal about sharply divided judicial opinions. What the courts give, the courts can take away. The Constitution is still "what the judges say it is." Moreover, far more important than the particular result of a decision like that in the *Zorach* case is the judicial doctrine which emerges; and the *Zorach* case leaves much to be desired in that the Court avowed adherence to the *McColum* doctrine while rendering a new decision so inconsistent with it as to draw devastating criticism from the dissenting one-third of the bench. Again, important as the released-time question is, it is today a less important issue than that which has arisen over the role of religion in the program of the school itself. On this point the *Zorach* case is inconclusive.

The Court says that the tax-supported school may not "undertake religious instruction nor blend secular and sectarian education nor use secular institutions to force one or some religion on any person." The last clause probably has full popular approval; the first prohibition, if religious indoctrination is what is meant, will also be widely approved; but who is to say how much is included under the term "religious instruction"? Would the objective study of a religious census, or of the Protestant Reformation, or of the social programs of the churches and synagogues—would the study of these and innumerable other religious subjects of public interest and importance constitute "religious instruction"? It is doubtful whether any such broad and crippling exclusion was in the minds of the six justices who constituted the majority; yet the formula used lacks the explicitness desirable in a judicial opinion.

If one reflects seriously on the situation created by these conflicting decisions of the Supreme Court it is difficult to escape some rather profound implications. A majority of the present Court is now committed to the principle that the public schools should be responsive to the religious needs and desires of the communities of which they are a part. To be sure, the language quoted above sets a limit to such accommodation. But it seems sufficiently clear that so long as the community remains in substantial control of its schools there will be a variety of patterns of adjustment.

The crucial question concerning the propriety of religious teaching or observance in the public schools is always, Is it sectarian? To that question no judicial answer can be given except in *de facto* terms. The secular courts are not equipped to settle theological issues or to define sectarian differences; they can only pronounce upon a given practice in terms of the reaction to it on the part of the community. What does not give rise to sectarian strife does not get into the courts. What goes unchallenged in a community remains unchallenged by the State.

It follows that in religious matters, as in other matters where deeply laid patterns of thought and practice are involved, there is often a wide gap between what the courts say and what is actually done. At this moment a grievous issue has arisen in the South with respect to segregated schools. Will the Supreme Court override the "separate, but equal" rule and ban segregation altogether? Many people think that if this should happen the public school system in the South will suffer disaster. It is quite conceivable that a judicial attempt to enforce in a religiously homogeneous community a religious neutrality that is emphatically called for in a great industrial city would turn out to be abortive. To make all sections of the country conform to a uniform pattern may be beyond the effective power of the law. When it is recalled that less than two decades ago a federal census of religious bodies was vitiated because many ministers, resenting the pressure of government, refused to cooperate, it is not hard to imagine popular rejection of a court ruling that runs counter to the convictions of an overwhelming majority of the community.

Should events take such a course the courts might find their role limited to the vindication of individual religious liberties in concrete cases where the facts are clearly established. This would mean the abandonment of all efforts by the courts to prescribe in advance and in wholesale fashion the permissible

patterns of educational practice. If this statement has a radical sound, we need only reflect that the dicta laid down in the now famous *McCullum* case were violated in innumerable instances from one end of the country to another. This was due not only to the impossibility of bringing the practices in question under court review, but to a widely prevalent conviction that the Supreme Court had been wrong in setting such arbitrary limits to religious activity—a conviction which to all intents the Court has now justified.

But while we wait for a solution of the Constitutional problem through the slow working of democratic processes, a course of action for our typical, religiously mixed, American communities lies open before us. It was indicated last year by the Educational Policies Commission in its report, *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools*. In spite of a lack of explicitness in the *Zorach* doctrine it seems reasonable to proceed on the assumption that religious subject matter which is clearly a part of our cultural heritage and which permeates the various school disciplines can be properly introduced for objective study in the public school curriculum. The immediate need is for the development of methods suited to this purpose and a more adequate preparation of teachers to direct the study. If any actual infringement of liberty results the courts stand ready to correct it.—F. E. J.

## "Why Don't They Understand Us?"

### A Report on Germany

FRANKLIN H. LITTELL

IT is now possible to distinguish three separate phases of American policy in post-war Germany. There was overlapping, especially in personnel; but the dominant program emphases, executed faithfully or not, varied greatly as objectives and leadership shifted.

The first period was the Morgenthau era — the time of hatred, reprisals, and a Carthaginian peace. Various published accounts make it clear that the plans for democratic reconstruction, to be based on those elements which had proven anti-Nazi records, were already drawn up by civil affairs officers working in collaboration with our allies in England. Then, by a curious act of inter-departmental espionage, "a copy of an earlier preliminary draft of the plan (had been) transmitted directly through private

channels to the Secretary of the Treasury."<sup>1</sup> Gaining the ear of President Roosevelt, this man—whose bitterness was privately understandable but as a base for public policy inexcusable—succeeded in having all positive plans tabled and the so-called "goat pasture" policy adopted for Germany. Commented one of those who had worked in hope of basing Germany's "second chance at democracy" on the elements which had resisted Nazism: "It seems ironic that GI's who fought without hating should have been the object of patronizing concern by observers who hated without fighting."<sup>2</sup> The sudden

<sup>1</sup> Friedrich, Carl J., et. al., *American Experienced in Military Government in World War II* (Rinehart & Co., Inc., 1948), N. Y. p. 220.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 232.

emergence of the Morgenthau Plan in September of 1944 was accompanied by the announcement that "unconditional surrender" would be demanded—an announcement in which Russia did not join, as the Communists have many times since then called to the attention of the German people; after this proclamation, according to informed observers of several nations, the Germans fought twice as hard. In lives and dollars it was an expensive announcement. After German capitulation, as part of the same settlement of reprisal, the American government joined in the agreement which dislodged millions from their homes in the East, an inhuman forced migration which bordered in fact on genocide and led one officer of the World Council of Churches to remark: "More people have been rendered homeless by an Allied peace than by a Nazi war."

In this first period of occupation, the U. S. A. abandoned the classical practices of due process of law—holding thousands for months without charge or trial, judging hundreds of thousands by category and "guilt by association" rather than on the basis of personal guilt, admitting evidence gained on occasion by a shocking brutalization of prisoners. A sound theological premise, the common guilt of the German people for crimes against humanity committed by a Nazi government, was made into a nasty political theorem which was presumed to justify wrongs committed by the occupation. It is an unnecessary phantasy to claim that American occupation policy was at that time a tool of world Communist strategy, as some have done, although there were well-placed fellow-travellers in the Military Government (a far more considerable influence than later under the State Department's High Commission for Germany). But the fact remains that American policy during the Morgenthau era played right into the hands of the Russians; only the very excesses of the Communists themselves, especially in looting the East Zone and enslaving and brutalizing POW's, saved the West Zone from the returns due on a policy conceived in hatred and executed with malice.

The *second* period was what we might call "the idealistic phase"; although in their best year the programs of "re-orientation," "democratization," ideological and spiritual battle, never had over 2 per cent of the occupation budget, they still were the dominant symbols of occupation purpose. The breakthrough to a change of approach, to an attempt to search out and strengthen genuinely democratic forces in the German scene, came in part as a result of the pressure of educators and churchmen who saw the disastrous consequences of a permanently negative policy; the period of reconstruction which followed was characterized by relief work and democratic experiment, both public and private sponsored. This was the period in which the scope of the Tru-

man Doctrine and the Marshall Plan replaced the limited perspective of Morgenthau and Byrnes, in which in some circles at least a determined effort was made to win the hearts of the German people for the democratic way of life. Informed observers from General Clay through to reliable German democrats were convinced that it would take at least twenty years to tend the green shoots until they might be strong enough to produce and re-produce for a healthy and democratic Republic; we had just three and a half years, and that only in the western portion of Germany. Quadripartite action did not outlast the period of political fumigation and negative controls.

By July 1, 1951, and certainly by January 1, 1952, it was perfectly clear that West Germany was living in a *third* period of occupation policy; the objectives were again predominantly military. The question was no longer, "Will German democracy live this time?" but, "Will they fight, and if so, will they fight for us?" Whether this last shift of policy reflects primarily accommodation to increasing pressure from the Communist world, or the growing dominance of the military mind in shaping American foreign policy, or perhaps a wise pessimism as to how long the American tax-payer would labor for intangible returns, the scuttling of citizens' committees, educational reform, youth program, social action projects among progressive elements, etc., has been tragic. And the increasing resentment toward our occupation, marked by growing outbreaks in the streets and in the press, reveals the fact that the German people are suspicious that our newest shift of policy is away from investment in them and answering their needs toward using them to serve our own immediate interests.

This outline sketch will have been useful if it establishes one point: the American occupation has itself been anything but coherent in its objectives and policies in Germany. Americans at home are so sure of their own consistent intention to see Germany a healthy and peaceful part of the international community that they frequently fail to appreciate how irregular and uncertain the policies of their government can seem to those on the receiving end. And all too often certain agencies of the government have been in more or less open revolt against official policy that did exist; the most notorious example of this has been American Army contempt for declared policy in regard to return of installations to German church and educational societies, and in demanding insistently the conquerors' claims to house servants and other perquisites inconsistent with a "sovereign" Bonn Republic. There is a Deaconess Hospital in Nuremberg which once housed 42 nursing sisters working in the Maria-Martha Hospital. It was early requisitioned for oc-



cupation use, and the nurses turned out. Then, in 1948, a regulation was adopted that essential church installations should be returned to the societies using them for charitable purposes; for over three years, top German churchmen, responsible officers in the High Commission, American church leaders, and even two Senators in Washington, have been trying to get the Nuremberg Military Post to obey Army regulations and yield an essential property which has at times housed only one DAC. The newspapers have recently hailed Mr. McCloy's victory, after a year of effort at top level, in getting the American Army in Germany to give up its special privileges and accommodate its demands to the necessities of American foreign policy; they have not, however, given details over days, weeks, months, years, as to the multitude of instances in which the military brass has promoted its own interests at the expense of a winsome impingement of the American way of life. As a German colleague, anti-Nazi and pro-Western, murmured once while watching a military review: "There's no doubt that German militarism isn't what it used to be. But may one wonder whether the best racket today isn't American militarism?" Even avowed "neutralists" have expressed their opposition to any immediate withdrawal of American troops from Germany; most Germans are profoundly grateful at present indications that the U. S. A. intends to stand behind its commitments. But troops of "occupation" or "defense," living in another country, should be far better disciplined than ours have been; and it is not just in Asia that military professionals have attempted to dominate American foreign policy by tangential disobedience to stated policy.

A final matter of extraordinary importance to the attainment of our present objectives in Germany, and to a clear understanding of them by other peoples involved, is exceedingly difficult to summarize. Although seldom discussed, it is in some respects the most serious aspect of post-war Germany. The basic fact is that the land is, for an indefinite period of time, divided between East and West. One out of every five West Germans is an expellee, and until the recent border-closing the flight from Eastern tyranny continued in considerable flow. Now this division means to the average German simply that the victors fell out, and that he is again the victim of the ineptitudes of politicians. But to the German Protestant leaders that division has far more tragic implications. If you look to the Heartland of the Reformation, that area embracing Erfurt, Eisenach, Wittenberg, Schmalkalden, Leipzig and Halle, a startling fact leaps to meet the eye: *it is all in the Russian zone*. And we move hesitantly to the threshold of a most momentous fact: the gerrymandering of Germany at the present irregular line between East and West has created a situation in which more

than 80 per cent of the East Germans are Protestants, whereas the Roman Catholic Church enjoys a balance of power in the West (voting as a bloc). The great difficulty which the German Evangelical leaders have felt in accepting any semi-permanent division, their determination to keep the lines of communication and consultation open as long as possible, go back to elementary statistics: that Thuringia (77 per cent Protestant), Saxony (83.4 per cent Protestant), Berlin-Brandenburg (85 per cent Protestant), and the other strongholds<sup>3</sup> which made Germany for 400 years before Hitler (an avowed Roman Catholic and never excommunicated) the Protestant bulwark of the European Continent, are now on the other side of the Iron Curtain. And they do not forget that American troops were there, having driven under Patton to a point well east of Leipzig, later withdrawing to leave these cities of glorious heritage to the tender mercies of the Russians. Only Martin Niemöller, in his usual habit as an irritant, has brought the problem out in the open, referring to West Germany as "conceived in the Vatican and born in Washington."<sup>4</sup> This expression implies a causal connection which would today be hard to prove, but the kernel of truth is there.

The most courageous opposition to the Nazis came from the Old Prussian Union, which at one time was supporting one seventh of all its clergy by quiet, free-will offerings (after they had been removed by the Nazis from their pulpits); the Union was, moreover, operating two boot-leg seminaries for educating young ministers outside the Nazi-controlled universities. It may also be worth noting that Jews were riding on streetcars in Berlin three years after they were forbidden public conveyances and institutions in Bavaria (which shares with Austria distinction as the birthplace of Nazism, and like Austria the homeland of centuries of black reaction). You can take an economic map of Germany and superimpose the zone lines on it and make no sense; in fact, West German factories and East German fields cannot live without each other, as it is costing us hundreds of millions of dollars to find out. You can superimpose a military map with equal incredulity: the American taxpayers lost a million dollars a day during the great Air Lift because the Pentagon, with its claim to a monopoly in discussing defense of American interests, didn't even have the common sense after the war to keep a controlled supply route

<sup>3</sup> Cf. statistics in Beckmann, Joachim, ed., *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* (C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950), Gütersloh, pp. 534-35. According to 1946 figures, percentages in the E. Zone were 81.6 per cent Evangelicals and 12.2 per cent Roman Catholics; in the West 49.7 per cent Evangelicals and 46.3 per cent Roman Catholics. In the last 6 years the unbalance has shifted even further.

<sup>4</sup> Interview of December 16, 1949, with a reporter of the *Wiesbadener Kurier*.

open to the command city. You can take any other map; there is only one which makes sense, and that is a *map on confessional alignments*. And there are too many of the brass, military and civilian, who are sold on this fantastic hypothesis that the bulwark against atheistic Communism in Europe is a fiction called "Christendom"—based on the traditional religious culture of France, Italy and Spain—to let one believe that such divisions just happen! Those who still are convinced that the truest defense against totalitarianism is the vigorous faith of free men, rather than totalitarianism of another color of flag, should be aware that in post-war Germany the American government threw the center of resistance to the Nazis to the wolves, and then undertook to guarantee that area from Munich to Vienna which has spawned many questionable movements in history—the latest and blackest being National Socialism. Probably nothing which was done has more prejudiced our chances at a successful occupation.

\* \* \* \* \*

By now it should be clear to some readers that American policy in Germany has been neither as coherent and consistent as we like to claim, nor as self-evidently self-justifying as government publicity and public relations men try to make out. The amazing thing is not that American policy in its third phase has met cynicism in some circles and a loud lack of enthusiasm in others, but that the response has been as encouraging as it has. We must not forget that Germany, with an industrial production index last fall of 136 over a 1939 base of 100, is still spiritually and psychologically a sick society. But, so far as hostility to Communism is concerned, Germany (including the East, in any free election) is nowhere near as sick as France and Italy, and is certainly more dependable than Spain. It is precisely here that the overpowering pressure has come in recent months, to arm a hard shell around what are instinctively recognized to be the soft spots of Western Europe. In other words, the picture of Roman Catholic Christendom resisting atheistic Russian Communism makes a pretty picture in pastels; but in fact the degenerate remnants of a formerly dominant tradition do not today afford spiritual vigor sufficient to keep the French and Italians themselves from falling to the Communists, without our constant economic and political intervention. Only Germany, among the major powers, affords a clear and dependable base.

The activities of Professor Noack, Roman Catholic leader of the Bad Nauheimer Kreis, and of Dr. Martin Niemoeller, Evangelical Church President of Hessen-Nassau, have led to a considerable misunderstanding in America as to where the German people stand in relation to the West and its defense. Regardless of the theoretical merits of a neutralized

and disarmed Germany, it must be stated frankly that Noack and Niemoeller have been able only to federate small and politically insignificant elements of pacifists, rightists and fellow-travellers in a league against German re-armament. As vigorously as possible without a public fratricidal conflict the other Evangelical leaders have, by and large, disaffiliated themselves from Niemoeller's "neutralism" as a cloudy dream without real significance. Of utmost importance was a conference held November 5, 1951, between Chancellor Adenauer and members of the Cabinet on the one hand and leaders of the EKD on the other. Among the latter were all major personalities except Niemoeller and his intimates, and Bishop Hanns Lilje, who was ill at the time. Although it was stressed that the meeting was informal and informational in nature, it is understood that the churchmen pledged themselves to avoid polemical opposition to a German defense contribution in the West European Army, and the Bonn political leaders pledged themselves to watchful and consistent pursuit of German national reunion.

The writer is reminded of a personal conference with a now retired Bishop, one of the pillars of the church during the Third Reich and in founding the EKD after the war. A portion of the conversation went something like this:

Query: What do you think of Niemoeller's neutralism?

Answer: Pastor Niemoeller is utterly courageous—a prophetic spirit, but inclined to be too impulsive. He is of course no Communist sympathizer, as some of your people foolishly assert; but his Utopianism is nevertheless dangerous.

Query: Can you tolerate the thought of a semi-permanent division of Germany?

Answer: How permanent it may be, no one knows. We cannot accept union which would mean living under Communist domination.

Query: Would West Germans fight an aggression from the East?

Answer: Will we have the means to fight? We would certainly fight rather than submit to what we see occurring in Communist areas.

Query: Is it not terrible to think of Germans fighting Germans?

Answer: That is of course to be avoided if possible. Whether the East Germans would fight for the Communists is at least doubtful. It is also terrible to think of Germans fighting Frenchmen or Englishmen again. But you in America had your own *Buergerkrieg*; and it is still better to fight than to yield to slavery!

The point of view here represented is unquestionably the reluctant but definite judgment of the large majority of German church leaders. And their people, who are presently engaged in bargaining for the best terms possible, will follow them. It occurs to me that we might show a little more understanding

for them in their predicament, and sympathy for their constant hope that somehow the worst may be avoided. It is most unfortunate that at the present delicate time the management of our relations in Germany is rapidly reverting to men ignorant of cultural, ideological and spiritual factors, and all too often maliciously hostile to the German churchmen who have had the moral courage to criticize our own occupational excesses as well as condemn Russian Communism outright.

In my judgment, they understand us about as well as we deserve on the record. But whether or no, they have come to the conclusion that their interests and ours lie for the time being in the same community of defense.

## Correspondence

### National Council

Dear Sir:

When I responded a number of months ago to Dr. Niebuhr's invitation to comment on Dr. Bennett's editorial on "Whither the National Council," I had no idea of starting a running discussion in your pages.

The juxtaposition of my original letter with the report of the Princeton conference in your pages seemed to me unfortunate and gave a slant to my position which I would not have had happen could I have avoided it. So long as the comment in your pages seemed to arise from that chance (as I hoped) coincidence, I did not feel it would do any particular good to write to you again.

Now, however, that Dr. Van Dusen has in your issue of July 7th discussed my letter on its own merits and not merely because of its position in the Journal, I feel I ought to make at least this brief rejoinder, since this whole matter is of practical as well as theoretical significance.

Dr. Van Dusen suggests that my position finds its attractiveness and depends for its validity upon Aristotle's "golden mean" and a comfortable "Middle of the Road" position. Since I emphatically do not believe that it is either right or wise to try to find truth by taking a position midway between contradictions, since I do not think that the middle of the road is "safe" in the traffic of these days, and since I remember too the Church at Laodicea, I would like again to emphasize what I intended in my first letter, that the basis of my position is a doctrine of the Church and a doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

The basic question we are dealing with is this: How does the Spirit of God make Truth known to men? Is it only through the lonely and individualistic and rebellious prophet? The particular church tradition which Dr. Bennett, Dr. Van Dusen, and I all share emphasizes at least one other way. The Spirit speaks to a group of men gathered in faith and prayer ready to hear Him speak. The word is the final authority, but the interpretation of that word is given in our Church not to a single man, or to his however sure

conviction, but to a group of Christians bound together by faith and love who learn from each other as they learn from God.

My whole desire in writing my comment on Dr. Bennett's article was to urge those who share liberal and even radical convictions about the needs of our society not to isolate themselves from the possibility of Christian fellowship and creative work with the other Christians who have what are to them "impossible" economic or political views. Perhaps I should say that I have used and will use my influence for all that it is worth on Christian conservatives, urging them not to read out of the Church those who seem to them obnoxious, heretical, and subversive, thereby running the danger of confusing their own position with that of God.

The prophet (after he is dead it may be) needs no authentication by any of us. There have been prophets false and true, wise and foolish. The prophet by definition and by practice speaks as God speaks to him and woe to that man or to that Church or Council which fails to heed him when he speaks in the Spirit of God.

But surely just because a man has a radical economic view, he is not thereby proved to be a prophet. We are rather committed to the belief that God speaks through his word, interpreted by the Spirit in the Church, though that Church suffers by being led by fallible men.

So much for the theoretical discussion of this important question. Now to the practical: Dr. Van Dusen asks this question, "Has any great and creative Christian advance been pioneered by Conservatives?" I will mention two. Slavery was the economic fabric upon which the civilization of Greece and Asia Minor was built. We all agree that slavery is wrong, but St. Paul did not attack it. On the contrary, he has been often attacked for his conservative attitude toward it and towards government (see Ephesians 6:5-8 and Romans 13). Yet I believe that God used St. Paul, a conservative, to advance the cause of Christ by forwarding the Church which had in it then, as it does now, a long run creative power that no individual has alone.

Martin Luther is hardly known to us as an economic or social radical. I believe God used him for a great pioneering task — the reformation — conservative and partly wrong though he was.

With Dr. Bennett and Dr. Van Dusen, I realize full well that the ecumenical movement is at a critical point in its history. All I ask is that at the very moment when we are trying to build together a new and powerful Christian unity, we do not display that individualistic and arrogant assurance that we alone have the truth of God which is ever the source of schism, and disruption, and weakness.

EUGENE CARSON BLAKE.

PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

### Chambers' "Witness"

Dear Sir:

I am puzzled by your editorial (June 23, 1952) on Whittaker Chambers' autobiography, *Witness* (which you incorrectly cite as "The Witness"). It is obviously about some other book, or some other thesis. Since readers of the editorial who have not read the book



will be considerably misled, I feel called upon to offer a few corrections.

Right off the bat, the book is characterized as allowing us "to look at the spiritual confusion of our culture two decades ago." This is way off the subject. The book is chiefly and most pointedly about the spiritual confusion in our culture right now—or at least that which existed in the late 1940's.

Since Mr. Chambers has witnessed with utter sincerity and rare humility to *Christianity* and to *Crisis*, I find your comments on his "either/or" bafflingly unappreciative, and bafflingly directed toward somebody else's either/or.

Of course Chambers has an either/or. If there is a crisis, there is an either/or. Moreover, it is the peculiar genius of the Christian view of life and history to see an either/or involved in it. The *New Testament* is emphatically an either/or book. For this reason I find it remarkable that you should consider remarkable the Chambers conclusion "that the conflict today is between those who believe in God and those who accept Communism."

That is a simplification of Chambers' conclusion. He plainly qualifies it in two ways. (1) When he says "Communism" he intends it representatively, as applying to all the totalitarian movements of our time, whether of the right or of the left. As I say, this is clearly and heavily emphasized in the book. It was Chambers' awakening to the fascistic character of Communism that began his disillusionment. Hence there is no pertinence in the editorial sentence, "If this were correct there could be no alternative between Russia and Franco's Spain, between pure reaction and communist revolution."

In the second place, Chambers does not picture Communism as the total container of evil. He calls it "the most conspicuously menacing form of that rejection (of God)." That is true for his own personal experience—after all, the man is writing an autobiography, and for the year in which he wrote the book. But he adds, "But there are other forms of the same rejection, which in any case, Communism did not originate." The issue, as Chambers sees it, is whether God is the Lord or a superstition. I am unable to understand why that should not appeal to Christians.

Your comment on the fallibilities of "a formal belief in God" is very good in the abstract, but is irrelevant to Chambers' book. The orthodox, and probably the neo-orthodox, will find that the author of *Witness* has a distressingly informal belief in God. Mr. Chambers' religion is anything but an "uncritical religion." A good deal of his book provides an incisive criticism of formal religion. And it is certainly eloquent with understanding that, "One of the mysteries of evil is that men who worship the true God still have one further possibility of covert idolatry when they too simply identify their interest and their cause with God's will instead of allowing the encounter with the Divine to break the pride and pretension of man." This sentence, instead of being thrown out as a warning against the Chambers thesis, should have been offered as a summary of part of his testament. Indeed, I found the most single moving item in the book to be pp. 768-770, wherein is

described the ripping from his life of this "covert idolatry."

I think it should also be pointed out that *Witness* is not primarily a political book, but primarily a religious book. It is a political book only in the sense that, "At every point, religion and politics interlace" in this age. But what its author's alignments are in terms of practical partisan politics he does not say. He peddles no panaceas. He witnesses to the crisis of our era, and does so as a Christian.

HUGH S. TIGNER.

PLAINVILLE, NEW YORK

## News and Notes

### Christianity and Modern Man Lecture Transcripts

Transcripts of the course entitled "Christianity and Psychoanalysis," given in Washington in May as part of the Christianity and Modern Man series, are now being offered by the Organizing Committee of laymen who sponsor this series.

This was a course of five lectures, in the nature of a symposium, with two theologians, Dr. A. T. Mollegen and the Rev. Don Shaw, and two psychiatrists, Dr. Edith Weigert and Dr. Hans Loewald, discussing the views of the human personality taken by psychoanalysis and by Christianity.

Bound transcripts of the course may be obtained by writing to the Henderson Services, 1029 20th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. Price \$3.00, plus mailing fee; discount for orders of 3 or more.

### Mission to China

*This is a comment of the leading Christian journal in India about the good will mission that recently returned from China to India.*

The 16 members of the goodwill mission to China have returned to India, bringing with them happy recollections of the hospitality of the people, small tokens of their goodwill and the conviction that the historical ties between the two countries have not been impaired by political developments. The leader of the delegation, Mrs. Vijayalakshmi, said on arrival that they had traveled widely and seen something of the fine creative effort of New China and the dynamic spirit which motivates her people. Both of these had impressed them greatly. Most of the members told the Press that they were struck by the enthusiasm with which the Chinese were participating in the reconstruction of their country. The statements are polite expressions of general impressions. The members would not say anything further. The journalists and scholars in the Mission would amplify their views later when the country would have a reliable account of the state of affairs in new China, and some facts obscured by propaganda might be clarified. The general impression of enthusiasm which the Chinese apparently have given the delegation may point to the fact that the revolutionary changes had the approval of a large section of the population who have now settled down to the tasks of reconstruction. Light has to be thrown on the charges of restriction of per-

# Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion  
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

M. SEARLE BATES	LISTON POPE
JOHN C. BENNETT	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	AMOS N. WILDER
GLOSTER MONK, <i>Secretary</i>	

## CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	JOHN A. MACKAY
CHARLES W. GILKEY	FRANCIS P. MILLER
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	EDWARD L. PARSONS
UMPHREY LEE	

sonal freedom and of the campaign of "brain washing" which have been brought against the Communist regime. India would appreciate facts the truth of which her eminent representatives would vouch for.

—*The Guardian*, Madras, India.

## "The Churches and Segregation"

On June 11th the General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. published an official statement and resolution in "The Churches and Segregation." This is a revision of an official statement titled "The Church and Race Relations" approved by The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America at a special meeting in 1946. Much publicity was given to the fact at the April meeting of the General Board of the National Council. It was decided to defer action on this statement. The statement includes the following paragraphs about the responsibility of the churches to eliminate segregation:

Christians in the United States, more than ever before, honestly desire that quality of Christian fellowship which brings to the total Church the gifts of all for the spiritual enrichment of each. Efforts directed toward such spiritual enrichment are frequently confused and ineffectual because of the pattern of segregation which defeats goodwill. Many persons find themselves frustrated when they attempt to live out their Christian impulses within a racially segregated society.

Detroit Public Library  
Book Receiving  
5201 Woodward Ave.  
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-53

The Church, when true to its higher destiny, has always understood that its gospel of good news has a two-fold function, namely:

To create new men with new motives;  
To create a new society wherein such men will find a favorable environment within which to live their Christian convictions.

The churches in the United States, while earnestly striving to nurture and develop individuals of goodwill, have not dealt adequately with the fundamental pattern of segregation in our society which thwarts their efforts. This must be corrected. The churches should continue to emphasize the first function. In addition, they must launch a more comprehensive program of action in fulfillment of the second function. This is imperative now.

The communions and the interdenominational agencies have faced this question and taken action on it. A number of the interdenominational agencies which merged to form the National Council of Churches had renounced the pattern of segregation based on race, color or national origin as unnecessary and undesirable and a violation of basic Christian principles. A number of the communions have adopted the 1946 statement of the Federal Council of Churches and others have adopted statements of their own on this question.

The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. in its organizational structure and operation, renounces and earnestly recommends to its member churches that they renounce the pattern of segregation based on race, color or national origin as unnecessary and undesirable and a violation of the Gospel of love and human brotherhood. While recognizing that historical and social factors make it more difficult for some churches than for others to realize the Christian ideal of non-segregation, the Council urges all of its constituent members to work steadily and progressively towards a non-segregated church as the goal which is set forth in the faith and practice of the early Christian community and inherent in the New Testament idea of the Church of Christ. As proof of our sincerity in this renunciation, the National Council of Churches will work for a non-segregated church and a non-segregated community.

The complete text may be had from the National Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Ave., New York 10, New York, ten cents each.

## Author in This Issue

Before his recent appointment at Boston University, Dean Franklin H. Littell was two and one half years Religious Affairs Adviser with the occupation in Germany.

## Summer Vacation

We wish to remind our readers that this is the last issue before the office closes for vacation, on August 1st. The office will reopen on September 2nd. The first issue following the vacation will be September 15th.